

Entered on Docket October 29, 2007 7:-- /gi

Hon. Linda B. Riegle United States Bankruptcy Judge

5

6

7

8

9

1

2

3

### LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

3993 Howard Hughes Parkway, Suite 600 Las Vegas, NV 89169-5996 Facsimile (702) 949-8321 Telephone (702) 949-8320

Susan M. Freeman AZ State Bar No. 004199

Email: sfreeman@lrlaw.com Rob Charles NV State Bar No. 006593

Email: rcharles@lrlaw.com

John Hinderaker AZ State Bar No. 018024

Email: jhindera@lrlaw.com

Attorneys for USACM Liquidating Trust

12

11

# UNITED STATES BANKRUPTCY COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

14 In re:

USA COMMERCIAL MORTGAGE COMPANY,

USA CAPITAL REALTY ADVISORS, LLC,

USA CAPITAL DIVERSIFIED TRUST DEED FUND, LLC,

USA CAPITAL FIRST TRUST DEED FUND, LLC,

USA SECURITIES, LLC,

Debtors.

22

23

24

#### Affects:

□All Debtors

■ USA Commercial Mortgage Company

☐ USA Capital Realty Advisors, LLC

☐ USA Capital Diversified Trust Deed Fund, LLC

☐ USA Capital First Trust Deed Fund, LLC

☐ USA Securities, LLC

2526

Case No. BK-S-06-10725-LBR Case No. BK-S-06-10726-LBR

Case No. BK-S-06-10727-LBR

Case No. BK-S-06-10728-LBR Case No. BK-S-06-10729-LBR

#### CHAPTER 11

Jointly Administered Under Case No. BK-S-06-10725 LBR

Date of Hearing: October 15, 2007 Time of Hearing: 9:30 a.m. 

# ORDER SUSTAINING THE USACM LIQUIDATING TRUST'S OBJECTION TO CLAIM NO(S). 10725-01336 AND 10725-01349 FILED BY JAMES AND CATHERINE LOFTFIELD AS IMPROPERLY ASERTING SECURED STATUS

James and Catherine Loftfield filed Proof of Claim No(s). 10725-01336 and 10725-01349, which asserted a secured claim(s) against USA Commercial Mortgage Company ("USACM").

The USACM Liquidating Trust (the "USACM Trust") filed its Eighteenth Omnibus Objection [DE 3168] (the "Objection"), which challenged James and Catherine Loftfield's assertion of secured status and sought to have the Court reclassify James and Catherine Loftfield's claim(s) as a general unsecured claim(s). The Appropriate notice of the Objection was given.

James and Catherine Loftfield sent an informal response opposing the Objection directly to counsel for the USACM Trust. That informal response was not filed with the Court.

The USACM Trust filed its Motion for Summary Judgment Regarding (1)
Responses to the USACM Trust's First Through Thirty-Third Omnibus Objections to
Claims Asserting a Secured Status; (2) Responses to USACM Trust's First through Third
Omnibus Objections to Claims Asserting a Priority Status; and (3) Newly Alleged Secured
and Priority Claims (the "Motion") [DE 4291]. The Motion sought summary judgment on
the Objection and asked that the Court sustain the Objection. Appropriate notice of the
Motion was given to James and Catherine Loftfield.

James and Catherine Loftfield did not respond to the Motion.

The Court heard the Motion on October 15, 2007. James and Catherine Loftfield did not appear at the hearing to contest the Motion.

Based upon the foregoing and good cause appearing,

2 228496.1

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

- 1. Granting the Motion [DE 4291] as it relates to Proof of Claim No(s). 10725-01336 and 10725-01349 filed by James and Catherine Loftfield;
- 2. Sustaining the Eighteenth Objection [DE 3168] as it relates to Proof of Claim No(s). 10725-01336 and 10725-01349 filed by James and Catherine Loftfield; and
- 3. Reclassifying Proof of Claim No(s). 10725-01336 and 10725-01349 filed by James and Catherine Loftfield as a general unsecured claim(s) subject to further objection by the USACM Liquidating Trust.

###

PREPARED AND SUBMITTED:

## LEWIS AND ROCA LLP

By: /s/ RC (#0006593)

Susan M. Freeman (pro hac vice)
Rob Charles
John Hinderaker (pro hac vice)

Attorneys for USACM Liquidating Trust

228496.1

1	CERTIFICATION OF COUNSEL PURSUANT TO LOCAL RULE 9021	
2	In accordance with Local Rule 9021, the undersigned certifies:	
3		The Court waived the requirements of LR 9021.
4		I have delivered a copy of this proposed order to all counsel who appeared at the
5		hearing, any unrepresented parties who appeared at the hearing, and any trustee appointed in this case, and each has approved or disapproved the order, or failed to respond, as indicated below:
6 7		approved the form of this order;
8		$\square$ waived the right to review the order;
9		☐ failed to file and serve papers in accordance with LR 9021(c); and/or
10		failed to sign and return this proposed order within five (5) business days in accordance with LR 9021(b).
11		I have delivered a copy of this proposed order to all attorneys and unrepresented parties who appeared at the hearing regarding this matter and/or who filed a
12		written objection and all have either approved the form of this order, waived the right to review the order, failed to file and serve papers in accordance with LR 9021(c) and the following have disapproved the form of the order.
13	X	No opposition was filed and no other party or counsel appeared at the hearing.
14 15		
	LEWIS AND ROCA LEI	
16	Sugar M. France	
17	Rob Charles	
18	Attorneys	s for USACM Liquidating Trust
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		

4 228496.1